



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/925,486

08/10/2001

Shingo Eguchi

12732-067001

2842

26171 7590 06/18/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

SEFER, AHMED N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2826

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/925,486	Applicant(s) EGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner A. Sefer	Art Unit 2826	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 18-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13,14 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed March 29, 2007 has been entered and new claim 28 has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. ("Yamazaki") USPN 5,818,070.

Yamazaki discloses in figs. 1-4 a semiconductor device comprising: a first electrode 102/104; an insulating film 106/101 formed on said first electrode; a contact hole 145 (fig. 4A) which is provided in said insulating film and has a depth so as to reach said first electrode; a gate wiring 112/114 which is formed on said insulating film and connected with said first electrode through said contact hole; a second electrode 113/115 provided on said insulating film, wherein said gate wiring and said second electrode are provided on and are in physical contact with said insulating film (figs. 1D and 2D).

Although Yamazaki discloses (see fig. 4A and col. 2, lines 15-25) that the first and second gate lines/electrodes substantially overlap each other and that Yamazaki's fig. 4A shows the first electrode 102 being overlapped with the second electrode 113, the percentage of overlap is not specifically disclosed. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

Art Unit: 2826

time the invention was made to meet the recited percentage of overlap, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Re claim 14, Yamazaki teaches employing the invention in an active matrix liquid crystal device, but does not specifically disclose a liquid crystal layer provided over said second electrode. However, it would have been obvious to form to employ a liquid crystal layer with Yamazaki's device since it is conventional in the art of making liquid crystal device.

Re claim 17, Yamazaki omits that electronic equipment selected from the group consisting of a video camera, a digital camera and other various electronic equipment. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that an electronic equipment comprising a display device wherein said electronic equipment selected from the group consisting of a video camera or a digital camera is conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used any of the various electronic equipment since Examiner takes Official Notice that due to their low power consumption, displays have become a necessary and indispensable structural element of an electronic equipment.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-12 and 18-27 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2826

6. Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. Sefer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1921.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached on (571) 272-1236.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANS
June 7, 2007


A. Sefer
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2826